

October 16, 2001

Allen Fiksdal, Manager  
EFSEC  
P.O. Box 43172  
Olympia, WA 98504-3172

RECEIVED

OCT 16 2001

RE: Sumas Energy 2

ENERGY FACILITY SITE  
EVALUATION COUNCIL

Dear EFSEC,

Thank you, once again, for taking comments on SE2's proposed gas fired power plant. We commend the council for their decision to recommend denial of this permit last February. The changes that SE2 has proposed are not significant enough for you to change your stand. Sumas is still an inappropriate place for this power plant. Following are our concerns with aspects of the DSEIS.

Air Quality (Greenhouse Gases): "SE2 now proposes to pay \$8.44 million to the Oregon Climate Trust in order to offset the CO2 emissions that exceed the Oregon Standard." Their solution is to throw money at the problem. However, this does nothing for the trapped air in the box canyon that flows up north. Acid rain and global warming are serious concerns that will be exacerbated by a plant such as SE2. Also, the council needs to consider the cumulative effect that the proliferation of power plants in the area will have on the local air quality. Sumas is a small town away from large population centers on this side of the border. However, it is very near a large population base that lies north of the border. It is inappropriate to site an energy facility near a large population base, even if it is in another country. We need to be better neighbors than that.

Ground Water Quality: It appears that SE2 is willing to work with the city of Sumas, but if you have a well that lies outside of their 1 mile demarcation, you may have no recourse if problems occur.

Ground Water Quantity: There is currently a process occurring in Whatcom County that will inventory water usage throughout the county. It seems that it is not wise to commit this large amount of water usage on a daily basis when we don't even know for sure that there will be water rights available for this quantity. The city of Lynden is currently working with the city of Bellingham to buy water from them, as they are in need of more water. They sit on top of the same aquifer as Sumas. Water is a valuable commodity; it should be conserved, not consumed at such large quantities. Farming depends on water. A lack of it could jeopardize the agricultural base that is so important to our county.

Flooding: If SE2 is not going to provide unsteady-state flood modeling until 6 months prior to construction, then how can you make informed decisions if you don't have all the information needed. We recently drove behind the proposed site, only to see large tracts of land raised in elevation for lumber storage. The land that has already been filled needs

1

2

3

4

to be accounted for in the flood modeling. The proposed site lies in a flood plain. The federal government has given money to buy up houses in Sumas through FEMA. The city of Sumas is applying for more grant money in order to buy up more houses in the flood plain. Common sense tells us this is the wrong location for such a facility.

4

There are many negative aspects to this proposal. There are certainly more appropriate locations proposed for gas fired power plants. It seems prudent and logical for the council to recommend denial of the permit for the proposed SE2. We trust you will, once again, say No to SE2.

Thank you for your time and consideration of this important matter.

Sincerely,



Candice Ambrosio



Dean Rogers